REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action dated August 3, 2011, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 10-17 and 19-22 are pending in the Application. Claims 1 and 19 are independent claims. Claims 20-21 are withdrawn.

In the Office Action, claims 12, 19 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. This rejection of claims 12, 19 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph is respectfully traversed. However, in the interest of expediting consideration and allowance of the pending claims, the Applicants have elected to amend the claims to clarify that the first speed results in a rotational speed used for driving the roller and the electric motor increases that rotational speed. The comparative language, i.e., higher is removed. With regard to claim 22 the Office Action fails to identify any indefiniteness. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejected claims are definite and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 4-6, 10-16, 19 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,933,960 to Avidor ("Avidor") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,434,828 to Andrews ("Andrews") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,442,840 to Zucker ("Zucker") and in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,661,907 to Apprille, Jr. ("Apprille"). Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Avidor in view of Andrews in view of Zucker in view

of Apprille and in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,038,472 to Iderosa ("Iderosa "). These

rejections are respectfully traversed. It is respectfully submitted that the rejected claims are

allowable over Avidor, Zucker, and Apprille for at least the following reasons.

It is undisputed, as admitted at pages 4-5 of the Office Action, that Avidor fails to

disclose "a handle attached to the body at a location of a pivot axis for exerting pressure on

the body, the location defining a force component resulting from the pressure distributed

equally between the device and the guard", as recited in claim 1. Apprille is cited to provide

that which is admitted missing from Avidor, however, it is respectfully submitted that

reliance on Apprille is misplaced. As argued in response to the previous amendment

Apprille discusses distribution among the cutting edges not "between the device and the

guard", as recited in the claims.

Apprille is referenced at col. 2, lines 32-36 and col. 7, lines 48-65, as disclosing

balancing out the force distribution based on the position of the pivotal axis. However, a

close reading of the referenced sections reveals that the forces are the "[s]having forces

are balanced equally over the cutting edges", see col. 2, and the "shaving forces applied to

the cutting edges", see col. 7. Placing the pivot axis in a location where "shaving forces

applied to the cutting edges" are balanced does not teach, disclose, or suggest, the

location defining a force component resulting from the pressure distributed equally between

the device and the guard. The claims are concerned with forces "distributed equally

between the device and the guard". These forces may include "shaving forces applied to

2003P02874WOUS-amd-11-01-11.doc

8

the cutting edges", but they also include all the other forces that affect the device for

stretching skin and the guard arranged in front of said cutting blade.

Moreover, claims 12 and 19 recite a motor for increasing the rotational speed. It is

respectfully submitted that this is not taught, disclosed, or suggested in the presented prior

art references.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is not anticipated or made obvious by the

presented prior art references. For example, Avidor, Andrews, Zucker, and Apprille do not

teach, disclose or suggest, amongst other patentable elements, (illustrative emphasis

added) "a handle attached to the body at a location of a pivot axis for exerting pressure on

the body, the location defining a force component resulting from the pressure distributed

equally between the device and the guard" as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in

claim 19. Further, Avidor, Zucker, and Apprille do not teach, disclose or suggest, amongst

other patentable elements, (illustrative emphasis added) "a roller driven with a rotational

speed resulting from the first speed for stretching skin coupled to the body behind said

cutting blades relative to the cutting direction" and "a motor coupled to the roller for

increasing the rotational speed", as recited in claim 19.

Iderosa is used to reject a dependent claim and as such does not remedy the

deficiencies of Avidor, Andrews, Zucker, and Apprille

Based on the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that the independent

claims are patentable and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. The dependent claims

respectively depend from one of the independent claims and accordingly are allowable for

2003P02874WOUS-amd-11-01-11.doc

9

PATENT

Serial No. 10/581,218

Amendment in Reply to Office Action of August 3, 2011

at least this reason as well as for the separately patentable elements contained in each of

the claims. Accordingly, separate consideration of each of the dependent claims is

respectfully requested.

In addition. Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner

that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections

and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented

remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support

of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived

and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

Applicants have made a diligent and sincere effort to place this application in

condition for immediate allowance and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory L. Thorne, Reg. 39,398

Attorney for Applicant(s)

November 1, 2011

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP

111 West Main Street Bay Shore, NY 11706 Tel: (631) 665-5139

Fax: (631) 665-5101

2003P02874WOUS-amd-11-01-11.doc

10